	Case 2:20-cv-02316-DAD-CSK Docume	nt 42	Filed 04/19/24	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	RONALD MEZA,	No	o. 2:20-cv-2316 D	OAD CSK P
12	Petitioner,			
13	v.	<u>O</u>	<u>RDER</u>	
14	CHRISTIAN PFEIFFER, Warden,			
15	Respondent.			
16]		
17	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. On September 19, 2022, the petition for			
18	writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 was dismissed as time barred and judgment was			
19	entered in favor of respondent. (ECF Nos. 38, 39.) On January 29, 2024, petitioner filed a			
20	motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF			
21	No. 40.) Petitioner seeks relief from the judgment based on, <u>inter alia</u> , evidence that petitioner			
22	suffers from mental defects in addition to schizophrenia that rendered petitioner mentally			
23	incompetent to meet the federal filing deadline, and that the inmate who previously prepared and			
24	filed documents on petitioner's behalf provided incorrect information to the court. Petitioner			
25	acknowledges that Rule 60(b) motions must ordinarily be filed within one year from the entry of			
26	judgment but argues that such deadline should	l not a	pply to a mentally	incompetent party. (ECF
27				

¹ Petitioner signed the motion and accompanying declaration, but it appears the documents were prepared by petitioner's new legal assistant, inmate James W. Brammer.

No. 40 at 30.) See e.g., Milam v. Harrington, 2018 WL 1155969 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2018) (despite judgment dismissing untimely habeas case years prior, court granted relief under Rule 60(b) where petitioner submitted new evidence of Milam's "documented mental health and intellectual problems," as well as attorney abandonment.), report and recommendation adopted, 2018 WL 1135451 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2018). Good cause appearing, respondent is directed to file a response to petitioner's motion to vacate the judgment. Respondent shall address both the timeliness and substance of the motion. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED within thirty days from the date of this order, respondent shall file a response to petitioner's motion (ECF No. 40), as set forth above, and petitioner may file a reply within fourteen days thereafter. Dated: April 19, 2024 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE /1/meza2316.60b.fb